Semantic extension of verbs of perception in Tamil

Rajendran Sankaravelayuthan

Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham

Coimbatore

rajusush@yahoo.com

1.Introduction

Neagu (2013) analyses the meanings of perception verbs in English, Romanian and French, starting from one important tenet of cognitive linguistics: "meanings are motivated and grounded more or less directly in experience, in our bodily, physical and social/cultural experiences, and then elaborated by the cognitive process of metaphor." Neagu (2013) presents from a cognitive linguistic perspective the polysemous meanings of prototypical verbs from the semantic field of perception.

The domain of physical perception is polysemous because it does not only refer to physical perception itself, but also extends its meaning to other domains of experience such as knowledge, reasoning, emotion, etc. Therefore, internal mental processes such as cognition and affection, thinking and emotion are metaphorically represented as perceptual processes. The first of this, COGNITION IS PERCEPTION, is extremely prolific in terms of lexis, especially the mapping (i.e. conceptual correspondence) UNDERSTANDING/KNOWING IS SEEING, where SEEING is the source domain and UNDERSTANDING or KNOWING stands for the target domain:

avaL-aal andta ndikazh-ukkaana kaaraNangkaL-ai paar-kka muTi-kiR-atu

she-INS that event-DAT-for reasons-ACC see-ADJP be-able-PRE-3NS

'She is able to understand the reason for that event'

In the case of perception verbs, it seems that these metaphorical mappings take place between two domains: the vocabulary of physical perception (concrete source domain) and the vocabulary of internal self and sensations (abstract target domain) and for the particular case of tactual verbs, between physical touching and emotion.

2. Sweetser's approach to verbs of perception

Sweetser's (1990) approach of metaphors of perception Sweetser (1990) analyses the semantic extensions of perception verbs in Indo-European languages, from a cognitive and diachronic viewpoint. We can follow Sweetser (1990: 29) taking the MIND-AS-BODY conceptual metaphor as the background of our discussion on semantic extension of verbs of perception. We can assume that this metaphor is motivated by our tendency to derive our vocabulary of the mind from our vocabulary of the body; in other words, we conceptualize one area of experience, i.e. the mind, in terms of another, i.e. the body. Sweetser's view is that this metaphor is probably motivated by the correspondences between our external experience and our internal emotional cognitive states. Another important point is that the correspondences between these two domains of experience are unidirectional: from the vocabulary of bodily experience to the vocabulary of psychological states and not the other way round. The cognitive linguistic view concerning the motivation of polysemy argues

that “The vocabulary of physical perception (...) shows systematic metaphorical connections with the vocabulary of internal self and internal sensations. These connections are not random correspondences, but highly motivated links between parallel or analogous areas of physical and internal sensation.” (Sweetser 1990: 45)

According to the semantic role of their subjects, perception verbs are classified in three groups: (1) involuntary/passive (or verbs of experience), (2) agentive/active (or verbs of activity), and (3) percept /stimulus subject verbs or copula verbs.

3. Ibarretxe-Antuñano’s (1999) model of polysemy in perception verbs

Ibarretxe-Antuñano (1999), another cognitive linguist, discusses the polysemy of perception verbs synchronically from a typological point of view. She focused on English, Basque, and Spanish. She identifies the advantages and shortcomings of Sweetser’s semantic account of perception verbs and Pustejovsky’s (1995) Generative Lexicon. She reviews the two approaches and proposes a complementary view. She (Ibarretxe-Antuñano 1999) characterizes the five senses (vision, hearing, taste, touch, and smell) in terms of certain properties. She believes them as the bodily basis of the semantic extensions of perception verbs. She classifies the main properties that characterize the different sense modalities in terms of three parameters. They are (1) the relation between the three main elements in perception: the perceiver (PR), the object perceived (OP) and the act of perception (P); (2) the applicability of the properties of the senses; (3) the interrelation among properties.

4. The bodily basis of the semantic field of perception

It is claimed in Cognitive Linguistics that the semantic extensions of perception verbs are based on the bodily basis of these verbs (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Sweetser 1990). But what exactly is the bodily basis for the field of perception is not spelt clearly. Ibarretxe-Antuñano (1999) believes that certain properties as bodily basis of the semantic extensions of perception verbs and she characterizes the five senses such as vision, hearing, taste, touch, and smell in terms of these. The description of these properties is based on physiological and psychological studies on senses. She identifies three parameters to classify the main properties that characterize the different sense modalities. They are the following:

(1) The relation between the three main elements in perception: the perceiver (PR), the object perceived (OP) and the act of perception (P);

(2) The applicability of the properties of the senses;

(3) The interrelation among properties.

She identifies the properties such as contact, closeness, internal, limits and location according to the first criterion. The property ‘contact’ has a positive value for the senses of touch and taste and has a negative value in the case of the senses of vision, hear and smell. The property ‘closeness’ has a positive value in the case of the three senses touch, smell, and taste and a negative value in the case of senses vision and hearing. The property ‘internal’ has a positive value in the case of hearing, smell and taste; and a negative value in the case of senses vision and touch. The property ‘limits’ refers to

whether the perceiver (PR) is aware of the boundaries imposed by the object perceived (OP) when perceived. For example, when we touch something we are invading the space of that thing/person we are touching. The property 'location', which applies to vision and hearing, refers to whether the perceiver (PR) is aware of the situation of the object perceived (OP) when perceiving. For example, vision gives us information about how far the object perceived (OP) is from the perceiver (PR). In the case of hearing, one can also identify the direction from which sounds are coming (sound localization).

Criterion (2) refers to the distribution of the properties mentioned above in the senses. For instance, the distribution of the properties 'limits' and 'location' is restricted only to some senses, as shown above. Finally, criterion, (3), refers to whether the properties are pure or composite, i.e., whether or not they are the result of the interrelation of several properties. The properties characterizing the source domain of sense perception can explain how some meanings are conveyed by certain perception verbs, and not others. They can also show what elements can take part in the generation of extended meanings. Relative to what and how much information from the source domain (SD) is selected and transferred onto the target domain (TD) Ibarretxe-Antuñano (1999) puts forward the hypothesis of 'Property Selection' which can account for semantic extensions that remain physical.

In previous Cognitive Linguistic literature the mapping process in metaphorical production and comprehension was viewed as being constrained by the so-called 'Invariance Principle' (Lakoff 1993) according to which "metaphorical mappings preserve the cognitive topology of the source domain in a way consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain." (Lakoff 1993: 215). The process called 'Property Selection', reminding, to some extent, of the 'Invariance Principle' states that the properties selected in the target domain must be part of the properties identified in the source domain and no others.

5. The compositional approach to polysemy

The semantic extensions of perception verbs are constrained by the bodily basis of the source domain from which they originated, structured by metaphor and property selection processes and also triggered by the semantic content of the different elements that co-occur in the same sentence, to a bigger or smaller degree. The relation between the polysemous senses of perception verbs and the semantic content of the co-occurring elements in the construction or sentence is the last issue discussed in Ibarretxe-Antuñano (1999).

Her view is in line with cognitive semantics where the traditional distinction between word meaning (lexical semantics) and sentence meaning (compositional semantics) is not seen as a useful division. Cognitive semanticists argue that while words do have well entrenched meanings, the meaning of any given word is constructed 'online', that is in the context in which it is being used. The principle of compositionality assumes that "words carry meaning in neatly packaged self-contained

units and that meaning construction results from the combination of these smaller units into larger units of meaning within a given grammatical structure" (Evans and Green 2006: 214).

Pustejovky's assumption that a core set of word senses is used to generate a larger set of word senses when individual lexical items are combined with others into phrases and clauses has been used in the case of verbs, where meaning extensions are achieved by the combination of the verb with its arguments.

The close connection between the actual senses of perception verbs and the syntactic configurations they enter has been emphasized in Nicula (2013). The Romanian linguist analyses the semantic field of perception verbs in Romanian by combining the semantic criterion with the syntactic criterion and argues that the meanings of perception verbs depend on the semantic nature of the selected arguments. She also establishes a link between the selected argument type and the different types of perception: physical/cognitive, direct/indirect, concrete/abstract.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano tests the hypothesis that meanings are achieved by the combination of the verb with its arguments in the semantic field of perception verbs and finds that the verb touch can express (1) an activity where contact is implied (e.g. John hardly touched the food) and (2) an accomplishment containing two subevents: an activity and a result (e.g. John touched Mary). In the latter example the verb touch is ambiguous in the sense that John can affect Mary physically (e.g. making her shiver) or metaphorically, that is, affecting her emotionally.

According to the degree of influence that the semantic content of the different lexical items has on the overall meaning, Ibarretxe-Antuñano (1999) identifies three degrees of compositionality: (a) ambiguous extensions, when it is not possible to predict what the interpretation is by means of argument selection:

(1) John touched Mary.

(b) verb-driven extensions, when it is the verb that mainly governs argument selection and meaning:

(2) Mary can smell danger from miles away.

(c) argument-driven extensions, when the meaning is mainly determined by the verb arguments and other elements of the sentence:

(3) John hardly touched the food.

These three degrees of compositionality relate to 'gradable polysemy', a hypothesis which states that extended meanings are obtained through the interaction of the different elements of a sentence. Ibarretxe-Antuñano's (1999) model of polysemy includes both conceptual polysemy, which is based on the bodily basis of the semantic field under analysis, and gradable polysemy, which is the overt realization of conceptual polysemy.

6. Classification of verbs of perception

Rajendran (1978, 2001:241-243) has classified verbs of five types based on the body parts concerned with the perception.

1. Perception related to eyes: The following verbs are simply the perception by eyes with certain difference in the manner of seeing: *teri* 'be seen', *pulappaTu* 'be seen' *paar* 'see', *kaaN* 'see', *ndookku* 'look at', *kavani* 'look at', *ndooTTamiTu* 'look at', *tarici* 'to glimpse', *tooRRamaLi* 'appear', *kaNNilpaTu* 'appear', *kaaTcikoTu* 'appear', *kaaTcitaa* 'appear', *tooRRamtaa* 'appear', *taricanamkoTu* 'appear', *kaNvai* 'keep eye on', *kaNpooTu* 'keep evil eye', *kaNpaTu* 'cast evil eye'
2. Perception related to ears: The following verbs can be glossed generally as 'hear' with cetain difference in the manner of hearing: *keeL* 'hear', *kavani* 'hear', *kaatukoTu* 'hear', *cevicaay* 'hear', *cevimaTu* 'hear', *kaatil vaangku* 'hear', *kaataalkeeL* 'hear', *oTTukkeeL* 'hear', *keeLvippaTu* 'hear', *kaatilvizhu* 'hear', *kaatilpooTTukkoL* 'hear', *kaatukoTuttukkeeL* 'hear', *kaatileeRu* 'hear'
3. Perception related to nose: The following verbs can be grouped as verbs related to perception by nose *maNa* 'smell', *mukar* 'smell', *moo* 'smell', *mooppampiTi* 'smell', *ndaaRu* 'smell bad', *ndaRRamaTi* ' smell bad', *maNamkamizh* 'smell good', *vaacanaiyaTi* 'smell good', *vaaTaiyaTi* 'smell bad'
4. Perception related to tongue: The verbs included here are sub-grouped into two: the verbs which take the experiencer as subject and the verbs which take the object as the subject. The verbs *ruci* (tr.) 'taste', *rucipaar* (tr.) 'taste (tr.), and *cuvai* 'taste (tr.)' come under the first group. The verbs *ini* 'taste sweet', *titti* 'taste more sweet', *kaca* 'taste bitter', *kai* 'taste bitter', *kaaRu* 'taste pungent', *uvar* 'taste pungent', *cuna* 'taste pungent', *uppukari* 'taste salty', *uppukai* 'taste salty', *puLi* 'taste sour', *eri* 'taste hot', and *kaandtu* 'taste hot' come under the second group. The former implies the experience of tasting and the latter implies the property of taste.
5. Perception related to sense of touch and pain: The verbs includes perceptions by skins such as *cuTu* 'feel hot', *taNu* 'feel cold', *kuLir* 'feel cold', *viRai* 'feel extreme cold', *kuucu* 'feel delicate', *kamaRu* 'feel irritation sensation in the throat', *kara kara* 'feel some sensation in the throat', *uuru* 'feel itching sensation', *kaTi* 'feel itching sensation', *uRuttu* 'feel irritation sensation in the eyes', *kari* 'feel irritating sensation in the eyes', *kaandtu* 'feel hot sensation', *vali* 'feel pain', *veetanani* 'feel pain', *uLai* 'feel a kind of pain', *kuttu* 'feel pricking sensation', *kaTu* 'feel pain', *paci* 'feel hungry', *tavi* 'feel thirsty'

6.1 Semantic extension of verbs of seeing

Let us take at least two verbs from the list of verbs of perception and explore their polysemy.

Semantic extension in *teri* 'be seen'

CMTD has listed 5 senses and groped them into two. The first group includes perception by eyes and the second group includes its extension related to intellection.

1. Be visible, be seen

   ing-irundtu paar-taal andta koopuratt-in ucci kaNN-ukkut teriy-um

here-from see-if that tower-LOC top eye-DAT ‘be-visible-FUT-3NS

‘The top of the tower will be visible to eyes if you see from here’

2. See

andta vayataanavaru-kkuk kaN ndanRaakat teriy-um

that old-man-DAT eye well see-3NS

‘That old man can see well’

3. Know

ena-kku avaL-ait teriy-um

I know she-ACC know-3NS

‘I know her’

4. Be known

avaL-uTaiya ndilaimai kaTitam muulam terindtatu

her position letter through be seen-PAS-3NS

‘Her position is known from the letter’

5. Appear

avan kuuRuv-atu tavaRu enRu teri-kiR-atu

he say-GER wrong that visible-PRE-3NS

‘What he says appears to be wrong’

The fourth and fifth senses substantiate the prediction that the verbs of perception take us to the domain of INTELLECTION.

Semantic extension in *paar* ‘see’

CMTD lists twenty six senses for the verb *paar* ‘see’ and classifies them into five groups. Seeing the object with shape is listed as the first one which can be considered as the prototypical meaning. The second group of senses is on ‘doing some action through seeing’. The third group of senses is the usage is of taking action. The fourth group of senses is the usage related to expressing feeling. The fifth group is concerned with other usages.

Basing his arguments on Ibarretxe-Antuñano (1999, 2002), Neagu says that vision has been studied most among the five senses and that one can find parallels between vision and intellection. A salient characteristic of vison and thought is the ability to pick out one stimulus at will from many. The other characteristic is that the vison gives us data from a distance and intellectual domain is understood as being an area of personal distance, in contrast to taste or touch that requires actual physical contact with the thing sensed, that is close to intimacy.

The semantic field of sight provides a vast number of extended meanings. Ibarretxe-Antuñano’s (1999, 2002) organizes them into four different classes according to the mappings between the (source) domain of physical visual perception and other (target) domains of experience. These categories are: (1) intellect or mental activity (2) social relationships, (3) reliability and assurance and (4) witness and refer to. All these classes can be considered subcases of the MIND-AS-

BODY metaphor, a conceptual metaphor "motivated by correspondences between our external experience and our internal emotional and cognitive states". (Sweetser 1990: 30).

The first group of metaphorical extensions is that which relates physical vision with the intellect or mental activity.

1. Understand, fore see

   avaL-ukku enna ndaTakk-um enpat-ai munivar tanatu njaana tirushTiy-aal paar-tt-aar

   she-DAT what happen-FUT that-ACC saint his intellectual-perception-INS see-PAS-3EP

   'The saint understood by his intellectual perception what will happen to her'

2. Imagine, visualize

   ndaan avaL-ai oru aaciriyar-aaka-p paar-kkiR-een

   I she-ACC one teacher-as see-PRE-1S

   'I see her as a teacher'

3. Consider, regard, judge

   ovvoruvarum tangkaL vaazhkkai-yai avarkaL viruppap-paTi paar-kinR-anar

   each-one their life-ACC their like-according-to see-PRE-3EP

   'Each one regards their life as they wish'

4. Revise, study

   ndaan at-ai evvaaRu cariceyy-a veeNT-um enRu paarkka-veeNT-um

   I that-ACC how correct-INF should-do that see-INF-should

   'I should study how to correct that'

The verb *paar* 'see' acquires meanings pertaining to a wider perceptual domain gradually. Here visual perception is associated with agentive processes such as 'meeting', 'visiting' and 'receiving'. All of these extensions can be referred to as social relationships. In these examples the verb *paar* 'see' expresses physical, direct perception and the perceived entities, marked [+ concrete] are in the visual area of the speaker:

5. Meet

   ndaan unn-ai aindu maNi-kkup paar-kkiR-een

   I you-ACC hour-DAT see-PRE-I

   "I will meet you at five O' clock'

6. Visit

   ndaan en vakkiil-ai paarkk-ap pook-a-veeNTum

   I my lawyer-ACC see-INF go-INF-should

   "I should visit my lawyer'

7. Receive

   TaakTar ungkaL-ai ipootu paar-pp-aar

   doctor you-ACC now see-FUT-3EP

   'The doctor will receive you now'

A third group of extended meaning of *paar* links vision to reliability and assurance. Nicula (2012) observes that these semantic extensions, relating to the agentive use of seeing usually occur in imperative sentences and that sometimes see functions as a down toner of a directive act.

8. Ascertain/find out, make sure

   andta veelaiy-ai uTanee muTikk-ap paar-u-ngkaL

   that work-ACC immediately finish-INF see-FUT- 2P

   'Make sure that the work is completed immediately'

9. Take care

   avaL kuzhandtaikaL-ai ndanRaakap paar-ttuk-koN-T-aaL

   she children-ACC well see-ADVP-have-PAS-3FS

   'She took care of the children well'

The fourth group of meanings possible in vision verbs includes witnessing and referring.

10. Witness, come across

    avan tan vaazhkkaiy-il pala iTaiyuuRukaL-aip paar-ttu-viT-T-aan

    he his life-LOC many difficulties-ACC see-ADVP-leave-PAS-3MS

    'He has witnessed many difficulties in his life'

11. Refer

    indta nduul-aip paRRi ndanku aRiy-a munnuraiy-aip paarkk-a-veeNTum

    this book-ACC about well know-INF preface-ACC see-INF-should

    'One should refer to the preface to know the book well'

In the four major groups of semantic extensions relating to vision that we have identified for Tamil is in parallel with English, French and Romanian found by Neagu (2013).

12. Hear

    In the following instance the sense of seeing is extended to sense of hearing.

    ndii col-v-at-aik paar-tt-aal avan var-a-maaTT-aan enRu toonRu-kiR-atu

    you say-PRE-GER-ACC see-PAS-if he come-INF-not-3MS that appear-PRE-3NS

    'It appears that he will not come if I listened to you'

The principle of compositionality assumes that words carry meaning in neatly packaged self-contained units and that meaning construction results from the combination of these smaller units into larger units of meaning within a given grammatical structure.

The verb *paar* 'see' collocates with certain verbs such as *kuur* 'be sharp', *veRi* 'be empty', *muRai* 'be haughty' and *aNNaa* ''hold the face up' in adverbial participle form and acquires special or extended sense as shown by the following example.

1. kuur-ndtu-paar 'look at attentively/sharply'

   avan avaL-aik kuur-ndtu paar-tt-aan

   he she-ACC be-sharp-ADVP see-PAS-3MS

   'He looked at her attentively/sharply'

2. veRittuppaar ‘give an empty look’
   avan maNal-ai veRi-ttup paar-tt-aan
   he sand-ACC be-empty-ADVP see-PAS-3MS
   ‘He gave an empty look at the sand’
3. muRaittuppaar ‘stare with at with contempt’
   avan raatai-yai muRai-ttup paar-tt-aan
   he Radha-ACC glower-ADVP see-PAS-3MS
   ‘He gave a stern look at Radha’
4. aNNaandtu paar ‘look up’
   avan vaanatt-ai aNNaandtu paar-tt-aan
   he sky-ACC look-upward-ADVP see-PAS-3MS
   ‘He looked up at the sky’

In all the above examples, *paar* gives the active sense of looking at and not the passive sense of seeing. The adverbial meaning suppresses or supersedes the perceptual sense. The verbs adhere to the principle of compositionality. The Principle of Semantic Compositionality (sometimes called 'Frege's Principle') is the principle that the meaning of a (syntactically complex) whole is a function only of the meanings of its (syntactic) parts together with the manner in which these parts were combined.The verb *paar* when collocated with certain nouns in object positon, get different interpretation leading to its extension of meaning. The resultant senses are the combination of both noun and the verb and the noun gives the primary sense and the verb gives activity sense.

	Object of collocation	
Examine	*kaireekai* ‘lines in the palm’	*kaireekaipaar* ‘read palm
“	jaatakam ‘horoscope’	*jaatakampaar* ‘examine horoscope’
“	*poruttam* ‘suitability’	*poruttampaar* ‘examine the suitability’
“	*patam* ‘quality’	*patampaar* ‘examine the quality’
“	*aazham* ‘depth’	*aazhampaar* ‘examine the depth’ (idiomatically means examine or measure one’s ability)
“	*ruci* ‘taste’	*rucipaar* ‘taste’
Find	*mukuurttam* ‘time for an auspicious function’	*mukuurttam paar* ‘find the auspicious time’
“	*maappiLai* ‘bride groom’	*maappiLaipaar* ‘find out bride groom’
“	*vazhi* ‘way’	*vazhipaar* ‘find out means’
Treat	*vaityam* ‘medical treatment’	*vaittiyampaar* ‘medically treat’
Feel	*irakkam* ‘compassion’	*iraakkam paar* ‘feel pity’
Do	*veelai* ‘work’	*veelai paar* ‘do work’
“	*pazhutu* ‘repair’	*pazhutu* paar ‘repair’

“	*etir*‘returns’	*etirpaar* ‘expect’

Usage of *paar* as an auxiliary verb

The verb *paar* as an auxiliary verb combines with infinitive form a main verb to denote attempt without accomplishment.

avan raataiy-aik koll-ap paar-tt-aan

he Radha-ACC kill-INF see-PAS-3MS

‘He tried to kill Radha’

avaL peenaav-ai tiruT-ap paar-tt-aaL

she pen-ACC steal-INF see-PAS-3FS

‘She tried to steal the pen’

The auxiliary *paar* combines with a past participle form of a main verb to denote an attempt with accomplishment. The *paar* in this context acquires different shades of meaning depending on the main verb with which it collocates.

avan paTam varai-ndtu paar-tt-aan

he picture draw-ADVP see-PAS-3MS

‘He drew a picture (i.e. practised to draw picture)’

avan andta ndaaval-ai paTi-ttup paar-tt-aan

he that novel-ACC read-ADVP see-PAS-3MS

‘He read the novel (to see its worth, etc.)’

avan kaar-ai ooTT-ip paar-tt-aan

he car-ACC drive-ADVP see-PAS-3MS

‘He drove the car (to see his capability in driving, or the condition of the car, etc.)’

avan puuv-ai mukar-ndtu paa-tt-aan

he flower-ACC smell-ADP see-PAS-3MS

‘He sniffed the flower (to find out its smell, etc.)’

Semantic extension in *kaaN* ‘see’

The verb *kaaN* is synonymous with *paar* giving the meaning ‘see’. But *kaaN* express more or less a passive perception as opposed to *paar* which expresses an active as well as passive perception. The verb *kaaN* (as well as a *paar* as a passive verb denoting passive perception) stresses the reception of visual impression or of visual impressions. The verb *paar* as a verb denoting active perception stresses on directing of the eyes to something or the fixing of the eyes on something to see it.

avan raataiy-ai vazhiy-il vaittuk kaN-T-aan

I Radha-ACC way-LOC at see-PAS-3MS

‘I saw Radha on the way’

CMTD lists sixteen senses for *kaaN* which are grouped into three. The prototypical or primary meaning is given as usages related to perception by eyes. The second one is usages related to

experience. The third one is on expectation. The verb *kaaN* when collocated with certain nouns in object positon, get different interpretation leading to its extension of meaning. The resultant senses are the combination of both noun and the verb and the noun gives the primary sense and the verb gives activity sense. The following table will illustrate the point.

Senses	Object of collocation	Collocated form
Dream	*kanavu* 'dream'	*kanavu kaaN* 'dream
Accomplishment	*veRRi* 'success'	*veRRikaaN* 'accomplish success'
"	*toolvi* 'failure'	*toolvikaaN* 'accomplish failure'
Find out	*muTivu* 'end/solution'	*muTivukaaN* 'find out solution'
"	*tiirvu* 'solution'	*tiirvukaaN* 'find out solution'
Experience	*inpam* 'pleasure'	*inpam kaaN* 'experience pleasure'

The negative form of the verb *kaaN*, *kaaNoom* 'not to be seen' is used with the meaning 'not doing', when comes after the infinitive form of a verb. Here it appears that *kaaN* is used as an auxiliary verb.

avaL ingkee var-ak-kaaN-oom

she here come-INF see-not

'She is not (seen) coming'

6.2. Semantic extension in *keeL* 'hear'

The verb *keeL* represents the domain of hearing. It prototypically denotes 'perceive with the ear the sound made by (someone or something)'. We understand hearing as being universally connected with the internal as well as the external aspects of speech perception. The metaphorical senses of the verbs of hearing can be easily inferred from this understanding. Sweetser (1990: 41) argues that "it is natural that physical auditory reception should be linked with heedfulness and internal receptivity ("not being deaf to someone's plea") and hence also to obedience ...."

Internal receptivity in the sense of understanding what is heard, is certainly often connected with the vocabulary of physical hearing:

ndii col-v-at-ai-k keeT-T-aal avan kuuRu-v-atu cari enRu toonRu-kiR-atu

you say-PRE-GER-ACC hear-PAS-if he say-PRE-GER that appear-PRE-3NS

'If I listen to you it appears that what he said is correct'

Readiness to internally receive and understand involves also a readiness to subject oneself to the speaker's influence and perhaps to respond in desired way. In fact, verbs of hearing by themselves do not mean 'obey' or 'pay attention'. It is in the context of conversation, hence interpersonal relation, that they acquire that meaning.

In both concrete and abstract sense and in all the meanings hearing is said to be the sense of linguistic communication. Therefore, some of the extended senses of hearing are: 'heed'/'pay attention to', and 'to obey'. In Tamil *keeL* is both passive and active; both the active way of hearing 'listen to' and passive way of hearing 'hear' the same verb.

1. Hear by ears passively

avan var-um vazhiy-il oru camptam keeT-T-aan

he come-ADJP way-LOC one sound hear-PAS-3MS

'He heard a sound on the way'

2. Hear by ears actively

avaL aaciriyar viLakku-v-at-ai ndanRaakak keeT-T-aaL

she teacher explain-FUT-GER-ACC well listen-PAS-3FS

'She listned to the teacher's explantion'

3. Heed/'pay attention to'

ndaan kuRu-v-at-ai keeL

'I say-FUT-GER-ACC listen

'Listen to what I am telling you'

4. (listen and) Obey

un ammaa kuRu-v-at-aik keeT-Tu ndaTa

your mother say-FUR-GER-ACC listen-ADVP act

'You act by listening to your mother'

5. 'To be told' and 'to be informed'

The above ones are other extended senses of hearing. But the senses 'to be told' and 'to be informed' cannot be denoted by the verb *keeL*, but by another verb of hearing *keeLvippaTu* 'be heard' (which is a compound verb of the type 'a noun+verbalizer').

avan ndaaLai ameerikkaav-ukkup poo-kiR-aan enRu keeLvippaT-T-een

he tomorrow America-DAT go-PRE-3MS that hear-PAS-1S

'I heard that he is going to America tomorrow.'

Like the verb of seeing, hearing can have a cognitive sense, i.e. understanding (2). The difference is that hearing is connected with the specifically communicative aspects of understanding rather than with intellection in general, as in the case of seeing. One of the extended meanings of hearing is 'to heed, to pay attention to' (3). A further development of this meaning is that in some contexts the speaker does not only demand attention, but also that the hearer should or shouldn't do what the speaker is telling him to do (4). The meanings 'pay attention to' and 'obey', illustrated in (3) and (4) respectively, involve the use of the agentive (active) counterparts of hearing 'listen to'. This is not surprising, as any act of linguistic communication (the target domain in this case) also involves the feature [+voluntary]. In other words, the property [+voluntary], which is part of the source domain, also characterizes the target domain. This is an instance of 'Property Selection', discussed

earlier. As for the meaning 'to be told', 'to be informed', it can be linked with the idea of evidentiality, in the sense that hearing verbs can provide two kinds of evidence: attached or direct when the source of the speaker's information is of a primary source; and indirect reported when the source is of secondary origin, that is hearsay. The contexts provided in (5) exemplify the latter type, i.e. mediated, indirect perception where the verb hear expresses a cognitive act (KNOWING/BEING TOLD IS HEARING) rather than a perceptual act proper.

6.3. Semantic extension in the sense of touching

Ibarretxe-Antuñano (1998) opines that the sense of touch has always been related to the field of emotions. She convinces her statement by quoting examples from English (I'm deeply touched, touching words). This is true for Tamil too.

avaLuTaiya peeccu en ndenjcait toTTatu

'her speech heart touch-PAST-3NS

'Her speech touched my heart'

Hans Kurath (1921) had already classified sense perception with respect to emotions. He has stated how the kinesthetic, the visceral, and the tactual perceptions have a relatively stronger tone than those of hearing and seeing, smelling and tasting. Kurath explained this transfer of meaning from sense perception to emotion on the basis of the similarity of feeling that both domains share. This connection finds an explanation in etymology as well. Buck (1949:1062) points out that in West Germanic languages the general word for 'feel of' and for 'feel' as 'perceive by touch' refers not only to the physical perception but also to the emotions, even in the earliest periods of the language. In the 90's, Sweetser (1990) proposed the same mappings between these two domains within the framework of cognitive linguistics. One of the main claims of this model (Johnson 1987, Lakoff 1987, Langacker 1987, 1991) is that linguistic structure is based on human cognition, i.e. on human perception and understanding of the world. As we have already seen the sense of sight and hearing are connected with intellectual processing. The cognitive explanation for the mapping between the source domain of touching and the target domain of emotions is provided in Sweetser (1990: 44). Sweetser points out that "Physical pain of any serious nature is bound to make the subject unhappy emotionally and physical pleasure or well-being certainly promotes a cheerful emotional state". It is interesting to note that the verb of touching not only maps the field of emotions, but also maps other semantic fields. The physical extended meaning 'to partake of food or drink' is exemplified in (1):

1. Partake of food or drink

1. ndaan andta uNav-ai toTa-villai

I that food-ACC touch-INF-not

'I have not touched the food'

The metaphorical extensions such as 'affect', 'reach' and 'deal with' are expressed below.

2. Affect

avaL veeNTukooL enn-ai aazhamaakat toT-T-atu

her appeal I-ACC deeply touch-PAS-3NS

'Her appeal touched me deeply'

3. Reach

avan tan tozhil-il uyar-ndt-a iTatt-ait toT-T-aan

he his career-LOC highest place-ACC touch-PAS-3MS

'He reached the highest position in his career'

4. Deal with

ndaan andta cikkal-ait toTa-maaTT-een

I that problem-ACC touch-INF-not-1S

'I will not deal with that problem'

The sense 'partake of food or drink' can occur in argument driven expression (1) and sense 'affect' occurs in verb-driven expression (2). In other words, the same elements were crucial in the lexicalisation of meanings in Tamil. The compositionality (the co-occurring elements) plays a part in the proper interpretation.

6.4. Semantic extension in smelling verbs

The sense of smell is considered a weaker source domain for metaphorical meanings in comparison with the other senses. Sweetser (1990: 43) takes the view that this sense "has fewer and less deep metaphorical connections with the mental domain than the other senses". The verb *mukar* simply means 'smell' by the sense organ nose. But *mooppampiTi* which denotes the active way of smelling, that is sniffing, has at least two metaphorical senses: 'suspect' (3) and 'to guess beforehand, to sense something intuitively' (4) apart from its physical meaning (2).

1. Smell

avan andta puuv-ai mukar-nd-aan

he that flower-ACC smell-PAS-3MS

'He smelled the flower'

2. Sniff

pooliis ndaay mooppampiTi-ttu andta kolaikaaran-aik kaNTupiTi-tt-atu

police dog sniff-PAS-ADVP that murderer -ACC find-PAS-3NS

'The police dog found out the murderer by sniffing'

3. Suspect

avan andta oppandtatt-il uuzhal-ai mooppampiTi-tt-aan

he that dealing-LOC corruption sniff-PAS-PAS-3MS

'He suspected corruption in the dealing'

4. Guess beforehand, sense something intuitively

ndaan cinimaav-ukkup poo-n-at-ai avaL eppaTiyyoo mooppampiTi-ttu-viT-T-aaL

I cinema-DAT go-PAS-GER-ACC she somehow sniff-ADVP-leave-PAS-3FS

'She somehow guessed that I went to cinema'

Although sometimes ‘guess’ and ‘suspect’ can be taken as synonyms, in the above examples they appear to be different. ‘Suspect’ always carries a negative meaning, while ‘guess’ might refer to either something negative or positive.

6.5. Semantic extension in taste verbs

Taste is a physical sense which seems to be universally linked to personal likes and dislikes or ‘tastes’ in people’s mind. Personal likes and dislikes in other domains − clothing, music, friends − are subjective, in the sense that they are variable across people. The verb *cuvai* ‘taste’ prototypically means ‘feeling tasty by the taste buds in the tongue.’

avan tinpaNTatt-aic cuvai-tt-aan

he eatable-ACC taste-PAS-3MS

‘He tasted the eatable’

The extended meanings that taste verbs of taste are:

1. Experience

avan toolviy-in viLaiv-ai cuvai-tt-aan

he failure-POS consequence-ACC taste-PAS-3MS

‘He experienced the consequence of failure’

2. Enjoy

avan paNakkaaran-aaka vaazhkkaiy-aic cuvai-tt-aan

he rich-person-as life-ACC enjoy-PAS-3MS

‘He enjoyed the life as a rich person’

7. Conclusion

The semantic extension of verbal meaning is interesting to study. The meaning extension of verbs is inevitable as there are only a limited numbers of verbs by means of which we need to express innumerable number of verbal concepts. The verbal extensions can be captured by context in which the collocations find a vital part. We tried to capture the semantic or meaning extensions of verbs by cognitive principles. Cognitive semantics offered us cognitive principles to explain the verbal extensions of meaning.

REFERENE

இராசேந்திரன் ச. மற்றும் க. பாக்கியராஜ். 2019. தமிழ் வினைகளின் பொருண்மை மாற்றமும் பொருண்மை நீட்சியும் [Semantic Change and Semantic Extension of Tamil Verbs]. Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 19:6 June 2019.

Evans, V., M. Green. 2006. Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction. New Jersey and London, Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ibarretxe-Antunano, Iraide. 1996. “Semantic extensions in the sense of smell.” ASJU, XXX-2: 631-643.

Ibarretxe-Antunano, Iraide. 1998. “Predictable vs. Unpredictable polysemy.” In: S.J Hwang and A. Lommel (eds.) LACUS Forum. 25:201-211.

Ibarretxe-Antunano, I. 1999. Polysemy and Metaphor in Perception Verbs: A Cross-linguistic Study. PhD Thesis. University of Edinburgh.

Ibarretxe-Antunano, I. 2002. "Mind-as-body as a cross-linguistic conceptual metaphor", Miscelanea. A Journal of English and American Studies, 25, 93-119.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide. 2006. "Cross-linguistic polysemy in tactile verbs", In J. Luchenbroers (eds.), Cognitive Linguistics Investigations across Languages, Fields, and Philosophical Boundaries, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 235-253.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide. 2008. "Vision metaphor for the intellect: Are they really cross-linguistic?", Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies, 30, 15-33.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. Metaphors we live by. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Lakoff, George. 1993. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor", In: A Ortony, Metaphor, and Thought, Cambridge University Press, Cambidge, 202-251.

Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark. 1980. Metaphors we live by. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Neagu, M. 1999. "Categories in Natural Languages: the study of Nominal Polysemy." in English and Romanian. Bzau, Alpha.

Neague, M 2013. What is Universal and what is language-specific in the polysemy of perception verb? RRL, LVIII, 3, p. 329-343, Bucureşti.

Nicula, I. 2013.The Rumaina Verbs of perception *vedea* and *auzi*. Between direct and indirect perception. RRL LVIII 3. P 313-327, Bucuresti 2013.

Pustejovsky, James. 1995. The Generative Lexicon. Cambridge/Mass.: MIT Press.

Rajendran, S. 1978. Syntax and semantics of Tamil verbs. PhD thesis. Pune: University of Poona.

Rajendran, S. 1982. "Verbs of seeing in Tamil." Bulletin of Deccan College Research Institute. Vol 41, 1982, p 151-159

Sweetser, E. 1990. From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press/